arXiv:1609.02380v1 [math.GR] 8 Sep 2016

AUTOMORPHISMS OF K-GROUPS II

PAUL FLAVELL

Abstract. This work is a continuation of *Automorphisms of K-groups I*, P. Flavell, preprint. The main object of study is a finite K-group G that admits an elementary abelian group A acting coprimely. For certain group theoretic properties $\mathcal{P}$, we study the $AC_G(A)$-invariant $\mathcal{P}$-subgroups of G. A number of results of McBride, *Near solvable signalizer functors on finite groups,* J. Algebra **78**(1) (1982) 181-214 and *Nonsolvable signalizer functors on finite groups,* J. Algebra **78**(1) (1982) 215-238 are extended.

One purpose of this work is to build a general theory of automorphisms, one of whose applications will be a new proof of the Nonsolvable Signalizer Functor Theorem. As an illustration, this work concludes with a new proof of a special case of that theorem due to Gorenstein and Lyons.

1. Introduction

This work is a continuation of [1]. Namely we consider an elementary abelian group A acting coprimely on the K-group G. The main focus is on how the $AC_G(A)$-invariant subgroups interact with each other and influence the global structure of G.

A new theme introduced is to consider a group theoretic property $\mathcal{P}$ for which G possesses a unique maximal normal $\mathcal{P}$-subgroup $O_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ and a unique normal subgroup $O^{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ that is minimal subject to the quotient being a $\mathcal{P}$-group. This leads to the notions of $\mathcal{P}$-component and $(A,\mathcal{P})$-component which generalize the notions of sol-component and (A,sol)-component introduced in [1]. In that paper, we considered how the A-components of an $AC_G(A)$-invariant subgroup H of G are related to the (A,sol)-components of G. In §7 we shall develop a partial extension of that theory to the $(A,\mathcal{P})$-components of H.

If in addition $\mathcal{P}$ is closed under extensions, it will be shown in §5 that G possesses a unique maximal $AC_G(A)$-invariant $\mathcal{P}$-subgroup. This generalizes a result of McBride [4] who proved it in the case $\mathcal{P}$ = "is solvable". McBride also introduced the notion of a *near A-solvable* group. In §6 we shall extend that work, introducing the notion of a *near $(A,\mathcal{P})$-group.*

The results of §5 and §6 have applications to the study of nonsolvable signalizer functors. In §8 we shall present a result of McBride [5, Theorem 6.5]. We have taken the liberty of naming this result the *McBride Dichotomy* since it establishes a fundamental dichotomy in the proof of the Nonsolvable Signalizer Functor Theorem. As a further application, this paper concludes with a new proof of a special case of the Nonsolvable Signalizer Functor Theorem due to Gorenstein and Lyons [3].

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 20D45 20D05 20E34 .

A considerable portion of this research was done whilst the author was in receipt of a Leverhulme Research Project grant and during visits to the Mathematisches Seminar, Christian-Albrechts-Universität, Kiel, Germany. The author expresses his thanks to the Leverhulme Trust for their support and to the Mathematisches Seminar for its hospitality.

2. $\mathcal{P}$-components

Throughout this section we assume the following.

Hypothesis 2.1. *$\mathcal{P}$ is a group theoretic property that satisfies:*

1. *$\mathcal{P}$ is subgroup and quotient closed.*
2. *If G/M and G/N are $\mathcal{P}$-groups then so is $G/M \cap N$.*
3. *If M and N are normal $\mathcal{P}$-subgroups of the group G then so is MN.*

Some obvious examples being: $\mathcal{P}$ = "is soluble"; "is nilpotent"; "is trivial"; "is of odd order".

For any group G we define:

$$O_{\mathcal{P}}(G) = \langle\, N \trianglelefteq G \mid N \text{ is a } \mathcal{P}\text{-group} \,\rangle$$

and

$$O^{\mathcal{P}}(G) = \bigcap \{\, N \trianglelefteq G \mid G/N \text{ is a } \mathcal{P}\text{-group} \,\}.$$

Then $O_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ is the unique maximal normal $\mathcal{P}$-subgroup of G and $O^{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ is the unique smallest normal subgroup whose quotient is a $\mathcal{P}$-group.

Definition 2.2. A *$\mathcal{P}$-component of G* is a subgroup K of G that satisfies

$$K \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq G,\ K/O_{\mathcal{P}}(K) \text{ is quasisimple and } K = O^{\mathcal{P}}(K).$$

The set of $\mathcal{P}$-components of G is denoted by

$$\mathrm{comp}_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$$

and we define

$$E_{\mathcal{P}}(G) = \langle\, \mathrm{comp}_{\mathcal{P}}(G) \,\rangle.$$

Lemma 2.3. *Let G be a group.*

(a) *$O_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ contains every subnormal $\mathcal{P}$-subgroup of G.*
(b) *If $N \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq G$ then $O_{\mathcal{P}}(N) = N \cap O_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$.*
(c) *If $H \leq G$ then $O_{\mathcal{P}}(G) \cap H \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(H)$.*
(d) *If $G = MN$ with $M, N \trianglelefteq G$ then $O^{\mathcal{P}}(G) = O^{\mathcal{P}}(M)O^{\mathcal{P}}(N)$.*

Proof. (a). Let N be a subnormal $\mathcal{P}$-subgroup of G and set $H = \langle\, N^G \,\rangle$. If $H = G$ then since $N \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq G$ we have $N = G$ and the result is clear. Suppose $H \neq G$ then by induction $N \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(H)$. Now $O_{\mathcal{P}}(H)\,\mathrm{char}\, H \trianglelefteq G$ so $O_{\mathcal{P}}(H) \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ and then $N \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$.

(b). This follows from (a) and the fact that $\mathcal{P}$ is subgroup closed.

(c). Because $\mathcal{P}$ is subgroup closed.

(d). Note that $O^{\mathcal{P}}(M)\,\mathrm{char}\, M \trianglelefteq G$. Set $\overline{G} = G/O^{\mathcal{P}}(M)O^{\mathcal{P}}(N)$. Then $\overline{G} = \overline{MN}$. Now $\overline{M}$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group since it is a quotient of the $\mathcal{P}$-group $M/O^{\mathcal{P}}(M)$. Similarly so is $\overline{N}$. Now $\overline{M}, \overline{N} \trianglelefteq \overline{G}$ whence $\overline{G}$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group and so $O^{\mathcal{P}}(G) \leq O^{\mathcal{P}}(M)O^{\mathcal{P}}(N)$.

Set $G^* = G/O^{\mathcal{P}}(G)$. Then M^* is a $\mathcal{P}$-group so $O^{\mathcal{P}}(M) \leq O^{\mathcal{P}}(G)$. Similarly $O^{\mathcal{P}}(N) \leq O^{\mathcal{P}}(G)$, completing the proof. □

Lemma 2.4. *Let G be a group and suppose $K, L \in \mathrm{comp}_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$.*

(a) *If $N \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq G$ then $\mathrm{comp}_{\mathcal{P}}(N) \subseteq \mathrm{comp}_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$.*
(b) *If $H \leq G$ and $K \leq H$ then $K \in \mathrm{comp}_{\mathcal{P}}(H)$.*
(c) *K is perfect and possesses a unique maximal normal subgroup, namely $Z(K \bmod O_{\mathcal{P}}(K))$.*

(d) *(Wielandt) Suppose* $N \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq G$. *Then either* $K \leq N$ *or* $[K, N] \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$.
(e) *If* $K \leq L$ *then* $K = L$.
(f) *Either*

$$K = L \text{ or } [K, L] \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(K) \cap O_{\mathcal{P}}(L).$$

In particular, K *and* L *normalize each other.*
(g) *If* $G_1, \ldots, G_n \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq G$ *and* $K \leq \langle\, G_1, \ldots, G_n \,\rangle$ *then* $K \leq G_i$ *for some* i.
(h) *If* $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathrm{comp}_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ *satisfy* $\langle\, \mathcal{C} \,\rangle = \langle\, \mathcal{D} \,\rangle$ *then* $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{D}$.
(i) $[K, O_{\mathcal{P}}(G)\,\mathrm{sol}(G)] \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$. *In particular* $O_{\mathcal{P}}(G)\,\mathrm{sol}(G)$ *normalizes every* $\mathcal{P}$*-component of* G.
(j) *Set* $\overline{G} = G/O_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$. *The map*

$$\mathrm{comp}_{\mathcal{P}}(G) \longrightarrow \mathrm{comp}(\overline{G}) \text{ defined by } K \mapsto \overline{K}$$

is an injection. If every $\mathcal{P}$*-group is solvable then it is a bijection.*

Proof. (a),(b). These follow immediately from the definition of $\mathcal{P}$-component.

(c). Suppose that N is a proper normal subgroup of K. Now $K/O^{\mathcal{P}}(K)$ is quasisimple so either $N \leq Z(K \bmod O_{\mathcal{P}}(K))$ or N maps onto $K/O^{\mathcal{P}}(K)$. Assume the latter. Then $K = NO_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$ so $K/N \cong O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)/O_{\mathcal{P}}(K) \cap N$, hence K/N is a $\mathcal{P}$-group. Then $K = O^{\mathcal{P}}(K) \leq N$ and $K = N$. Thus $Z(K \bmod O_{\mathcal{P}}(K))$ is the unique maximal normal subgroup of K. Also $K/O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$ is perfect so K' maps onto $K/O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$ and hence $K = K'$.

(d). Set $M = \langle\, N^G \,\rangle$. If $N = G$ then the conclusion is clear so assume $N \neq G$. Now $N \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq G$ so $M \neq G$. If $K \leq M$ then the conclusion follows by induction, so we may assume that $K \not\leq M$.

Suppose that K is not normal in KM. Now $K \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq KM$ so there exists $g \in KM$ such that K and K^g normalize each other but $K \neq K^g$. Set $T = K^g K$. Now $KM = K^g M$ so $T = K^g(T \cap M)$. Note that $K^g \trianglelefteq T$ and $T \cap M \trianglelefteq T$. Since $K \trianglelefteq T$ and K is perfect, we have $K = [K, T] = [K, K^g][K, T \cap M]$ and then $K = (K \cap K^g)(K \cap T \cap M)$. But $K \cap K^g$ and $K \cap T \cap M$ are proper normal subgroups of K, contrary to K having a unique maximal normal subgroup. We deduce that $K \trianglelefteq KM$, hence

$$[K, M] \leq K \cap M \leq Z(K \bmod O_{\mathcal{P}}(K))$$

and so $[K, M, K] \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$. Similarly $[M, K, K] \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$. Since $O_{\mathcal{P}}(K) \trianglelefteq KM$ and K is perfect, the Three Subgroups Lemma implies that $[K, M] \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$. Since $N \leq M$ we have $[K, N] \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$.

(e). We have $K \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq L$ so either $K = L$ or $K \leq Z(L \bmod O_{\mathcal{P}}(L))$. Assume the latter. Now K is perfect, whence $K \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(L)$ and K is a $\mathcal{P}$-group. This is not possible since $K = O^{\mathcal{P}}(K)$. Hence $K = L$.

(f). Assume that $K \neq L$. Then (c) implies $K \not\leq L$ and $L \not\leq K$. Two applications of (d) imply $[K, L] \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(K) \cap O_{\mathcal{P}}(L)$.

(g). Suppose $K \not\leq G_i$ for all i. Then (d) implies that $\langle\, G_1, \ldots, G_n \,\rangle$ normalizes K and centralizes $K/O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$. This is absurd since $K \leq \langle\, G_1, \ldots, G_n \,\rangle$ and $K/O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$ is perfect.

(h). Let $C \in \mathcal{C}$. By (g) there exists $D \in \mathcal{D}$ with $C \leq D$. Then (e) forces $C = D$, whence $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. Similarly $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$.

(i). Since K is not a $\mathcal{P}$-group and is perfect, we have $K \not\leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ and $K \not\leq \mathrm{sol}(G)$. Apply (d).

(j). Since $K \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq G$, (a) implies that $O_{\mathcal{P}}(K) = O_{\mathcal{P}}(G) \cap K$, whence $\overline{K} \cong K/O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$ and so $\overline{K}$ is quasisimple. Thus $\overline{K} \in \mathrm{comp}(\overline{G})$. Suppose that $\overline{K} = \overline{L}$. Then $K \leq LO_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$. As K is not a $\mathcal{P}$-group, (g) implies $K \leq L$ and then (e) forces $K = L$. Hence the map is an injection.

Suppose that every $\mathcal{P}$-group is solvable and that $\overline{C} \in \mathrm{comp}(\overline{G})$. Choose D minimal subject to $D \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq G$ and $\overline{D} = \overline{C}$. Suppose that $O^{\mathcal{P}}(D) \neq D$. Then $\overline{O^{\mathcal{P}}(D)} \leq Z(\overline{C})$ whence $\overline{C}/Z(\overline{C})$ is an image of $\overline{D}/\overline{O^{\mathcal{P}}(D)}$, which is an image of $D/O^{\mathcal{P}}(D)$. Thus $\overline{C}/Z(\overline{C})$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group. This is a contradiction since every $\mathcal{P}$-group is solvable. Hence $O^{\mathcal{P}}(D) = D$. As $D \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq G$ we have $O_{\mathcal{P}}(D) = D \cap O_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ so $D/O_{\mathcal{P}}(D) \cong \overline{C}$, which is quasisimple. Thus $D \in \mathrm{comp}_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$. □

We remark that in (j) the extra condition to ensure that the map is a bijection is needed. For example, let $\mathcal{P}$ be the property defined by G is a $\mathcal{P}$-group if and only if $G = \mathrm{sol}(G)E(G)$ and every component of G is isomorphic to A_5. Now let $G = A_5 \operatorname{wr} A_5$.

3. $(A, \mathcal{P})$-components

Throughout this section, assume the following.

Hypothesis 3.1.

- *Hypothesis 2.1.*
- *A is a finite group.*

Definition 3.2. Let G be a group on which A acts. An *$(A, \mathcal{P})$-component of G* is an A-invariant subgroup K of G that satisfies

$$K \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq G,\ K/O_{\mathcal{P}}(K) \text{ is } A\text{-quasisimple and } K = O^{\mathcal{P}}(K).$$

The set of $(A, \mathcal{P})$-components of G is denoted by

$$\mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathcal{P}}(G).$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let G be a group on which A acts. The $(A, \mathcal{P})$-components of G are the subgroups generated by the orbits of A on $\mathrm{comp}_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$. Distinct orbits generate distinct $(A, \mathcal{P})$-components.*

Proof. Suppose $\{ K_1, \ldots, K_n \}$ is an orbit of A on $\mathrm{comp}_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ and define $K = \langle K_1, \ldots, K_n \rangle$. Certainly $K \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq G$. Lemma 2.4(f) implies $K_i \trianglelefteq K$ for each i, so $K = K_1 \cdots K_n$. By Lemma 2.3(d), $O^{\mathcal{P}}(K) = O^{\mathcal{P}}(K_1) \cdots O^{\mathcal{P}}(K_n) = K_1 \cdots K_n = K$. Using Lemma 2.4(j), with K in the role of G, we see that $K/O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$ is the central product of the quasisimple groups $K_iO_{\mathcal{P}}(K)/O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$ and that these are permuted transitively by A. Thus $K/O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$ is A-quasisimple and hence K is an $(A, \mathcal{P})$-component.

Conversely suppose that $K \in \mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathcal{P}}(G)$. Set $\overline{K} = K/O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$ so that $\overline{K} = \overline{K_1} * \cdots * \overline{K_n}$ with each $\overline{K_i}$ quasisimple and A acting transitively on $\{ \overline{K_1}, \ldots, \overline{K_n} \}$. Let L_i be the inverse image of $\overline{K_i}$ in K. Then $L_i \trianglelefteq K$ and $K = L_1 \cdots L_n$. Set $K_i = O^{\mathcal{P}}(L_i) \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq G$. By Lemma 2.3(d) we have $K = O^{\mathcal{P}}(K) = K_1 \cdots K_n$. Then K_i maps onto $\overline{K_i}$ so $L_i = O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)K_i$. Again by Lemma 2.3(d), $K_i = O^{\mathcal{P}}(L_i) = O^{\mathcal{P}}(O_{\mathcal{P}}(K))O^{\mathcal{P}}(K_i) = O^{\mathcal{P}}(K_i)$. Thus $K_i \in \mathrm{comp}_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ and K is the subgroup generated by an orbit of A on $\mathrm{comp}_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$. Finally, Lemma 2.4(h) implies that distinct orbits generate distinct $(A, \mathcal{P})$-components. □

Lemma 3.4. *Let G be a group on which A acts and suppose $K, L \in \mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathcal{P}}(G)$.*

(a) *If N is an A-invariant subnormal subgroup of G then* $\mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathcal{P}}(N) \subseteq \mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathcal{P}}(G)$.
(b) *If H is an A-invariant subgroup of G and $K \leq H$ then* $K \in \mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathcal{P}}(H)$.
(c) *K is perfect and possesses a unique maximal A-invariant subnormal subgroup, namely* $Z(K \bmod O_{\mathcal{P}}(K))$.
(d) *Suppose N is an A-invariant subnormal subgroup of G. Then either $K \leq N$ or $[K, N] \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$.*
(e) *If $K \leq L$ then $K = L$.*
(f) *Either*

$$K = L \text{ or } [K, L] \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(K) \cap O_{\mathcal{P}}(L).$$

In particular, K and L normalize each other.
(g) *Suppose $G_1, \ldots, G_n$ are A-invariant subnormal subgroups of G and $K \leq \{ G_1, \ldots, G_n \}$ then $K \leq G_i$ for some i.*
(h) *Suppose $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathcal{P}}(G)$ satisfy $\langle \mathcal{C} \rangle = \langle \mathcal{D} \rangle$. Then $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{D}$.*
(i) *$[K, O_{\mathcal{P}}(G) \mathrm{sol}(G)] \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$. In particular, $O_{\mathcal{P}}(G) \mathrm{sol}(G)$ normalizes every $(A, \mathcal{P})$-component of G.*
(j) *Set $\overline{G} = G/O_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$. The map*

$$\mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathcal{P}}(G) \longrightarrow \mathrm{comp}_A(\overline{G}) \text{ defined by } K \mapsto \overline{K}$$

is an injection. If every $\mathcal{P}$-group is solvable then it is a bijection.
(k) *$K \trianglelefteq \langle K^G \rangle$.*

Proof. (a) and (b) are immediate from the definitions.

(c),(e),(f),(g),(h),(i),(j) follow with the same argument as used in the proof of Lemma 2.4.

(d) follows from Lemmas 3.3 and 2.4(d).

(k). By Lemma 3.3 we have $K = \langle K_1, \ldots, K_n \rangle$ where $\{ K_1, \ldots, K_n \} \subseteq \mathrm{comp}_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ so Lemma 2.4(f) implies $K_i \trianglelefteq \langle K^G \rangle$. Then $K \trianglelefteq \langle K^G \rangle$. □

4. Preliminaries

Lemma 4.1. *Let r be a prime and A and elementary abelian r-group that acts coprimely on the K-group G. Suppose $K \in \mathrm{comp}_A(G)$ and that H is an $AC_K(A)$-invariant subgroup of G with $H \cap K \leq Z(K)$. Then $[H, K] = 1$.*

Proof. Set $\overline{G} = G/Z(E(G))$. We have $[H, C_K(A)] \leq H \cap E(G)$ so as $K \trianglelefteq E(G)$ it follows that $[H, C_K(A), C_K(A)] \leq H \cap K \leq Z(K)$. Note that $C_{\overline{K}}(A) = \overline{C_K(A)}$ by Coprime Action. Then $[\overline{H}, C_{\overline{K}}(A), C_{\overline{K}}(A)] = 1$. The Three subgroups Lemma implies that $[\overline{H}, C_{\overline{K}}(A)'] = 1$. Then H permutes the components of $\overline{G}$ onto which $C_{\overline{K}}(A)'$ projects nontrivially. By [1, Theorem 4.4(a)], $C_{\overline{K}}(A)' \neq 1$ so these components are precisely the components of $\overline{K}$. We deduce that $\overline{H}$ normalizes $\overline{K}$ and then that H normalizes K. Then $[H, C_K(A)] \leq H \cap K \leq Z(K)$ so $[\overline{H}, C_{\overline{K}}(A)] = 1$. [1, Theorem 4.4(c)] implies that $[\overline{H}, \overline{K}] = 1$. Since K is perfect, it follows from the Three Subgroups Lemma that $[H, K] = 1$. □

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a group theoretic property that satisfies:*

(a) *$\mathcal{P}$ is subgroup and quotient closed.*
(b) *If G/M and G/N are $\mathcal{P}$-groups then so is $G/M \cap N$.*

Suppose the group A acts coprimely on the group G, that P is an A-invariant subgroup of G and that $K \in \mathrm{comp}_A(G)$. Assume that

$$C_K(A) \leq N_G(P) \text{ and } [P, C_K(A)] \text{ is a } \mathcal{P}\text{-group.}$$

Then

$$P \leq N_G(K) \text{ or } C_{K/Z(K)}(A) \text{ is a } \mathcal{P}\text{-group.}$$

Proof. Set $M = \langle\ C_K(A)^P\ \rangle = [P, C_K(A)]C_K(A) \leq E(G)$. We have $M = [P, C_K(A)](M \cap K)$ and $M \cap K \trianglelefteq M$ since $K \trianglelefteq E(G)$. Now $M/M \cap K$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group since it is isomorphic to a quotient of $[P, C_K(A)]$. Thus

$$O^{\mathcal{P}}(M) \leq M \cap K.$$

Since $P \leq N_G(M)$ we have $P \leq N_G(O^{\mathcal{P}}(M))$.

Set $E = E(G)$ and $\overline{G} = G/Z(E(G))$, so $\overline{E}$ is the direct product of the components of $\overline{G}$. Set $N = O^{\mathcal{P}}(M)$. Suppose that $\overline{N} \neq 1$. Now $\overline{N}$ is A-invariant so P permutes the components of $\overline{G}$ onto which $\overline{N}$ projects nontrivially. Since $\overline{N} \leq \overline{K}$ and both $\overline{N}$ and $\overline{K}$ are A-invariant, these components are precisely the components of $\overline{K}$. Then P normalizes $\overline{K}$ and hence K.

Suppose that $\overline{N} = 1$. Then $N \leq Z(E(G))$ and so $M/M \cap Z(E(G))$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group. As $C_K(A) \leq M$ and $Z(K) = K \cap Z(E(G))$ it follows that $C_K(A)/C_K(A) \cap Z(K)$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group. Since A acts coprimely on G, the quotient is isomorphic to $C_{K/Z(K)}(A)$, completing the proof. □

5. $\mathcal{P}$-subgroups

Definition 5.1. Let A be a group that acts on the group G and let $\mathcal{P}$ be a group theoretic property. Then

$$O_{\mathcal{P}}(G; A) = \langle\ P \leq G \mid \mathcal{P} \text{ is an } AC_G(A)\text{-invariant } \mathcal{P}\text{-subgroup}\ \rangle.$$

We are interested in situations where $O_{\mathcal{P}}(G; A)$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group, in other words, when does G possess a unique maximal $AC_G(A)$-invariant $\mathcal{P}$-subgroup? The goal of this section is to prove the following.

Theorem 5.2. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a group theoretic property that is closed under subgroups, quotients and extensions. Let A be an elementary abelian r-group for some prime r and assume that A acts coprimely on the K-group G. Then $O_{\mathcal{P}}(G; A)$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group.*

As an immediate consequence we have the following.

Corollary 5.3. *Let r be a prime and A an elementary abelian r-group that acts on the group G. Suppose that θ is an A-signalizer functor on G and that $\theta(a)$ is a K-group for all $a \in A^{\#}$.*

Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a group theoretic property that is closed under subgroups, quotients and extensions. Define $\theta_{\mathcal{P}}$ by

$$\theta_{\mathcal{P}}(a) = O_{\mathcal{P}}(\theta(a); A)$$

for all $a \in A^{\#}$. Then $\theta_{\mathcal{P}}$ is an A-signalizer functor.

This generalizes a result of McBride [4, Lemma 3.1], who proves it in the case $\mathcal{P}$ = "is solvable" and θ is near solvable.

Throughout the remainder of this section, we assume the hypotheses of Theorem 5.2.

Lemma 5.4. *Assume that N is an $AC_G(A)$-invariant subgroup of G.*

(a) *$C_G(A)$ normalizes $O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A)$.*
(b) *Suppose that $O_{\mathcal{P}}(G;A)$ and $O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A)$ are $\mathcal{P}$-groups. Then*

$$O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A) = O_{\mathcal{P}}(G;A) \cap N.$$

If in addition, $N \trianglelefteq G$ then $O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A) \trianglelefteq O_{\mathcal{P}}(G;A)$.
(c) *Suppose $N = N_1 \times \cdots \times N_m$ with each N_i being A-invariant. Then*

$$O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A) = O_{\mathcal{P}}(N_1;A) \times \cdots \times O_{\mathcal{P}}(N_m;A).$$

Proof. (a). Since $C_G(A)$ normalizes $AC_N(A)$, it permutes the $AC_N(A)$-invariant subgroups of N.

(b). By (a), $O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A) \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(G;A) \cap N$. Moreover, $O_{\mathcal{P}}(G;A) \cap N$ is an $AC_N(A)$-invariant $\mathcal{P}$-subgroup of N, proving the reverse inclusion.

(c). Trivial. □

Lemma 5.5. *Suppose that N is an A-invariant normal subgroup of G and that*

$$N = N_1 \times \cdots \times N_m$$

with each N_i being simple. For each i, let $\pi_i : N \longrightarrow N_i$ be the projection map. Suppose also that B is a subgroup of A that normalizes but does not centralize each N_i.

(a) *$C_N(A)\pi_i = C_{N_i}(B)$ for each i.*
(b) *$O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A) = O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;B)$.*
(c) *If X is an $AC_N(A)$-invariant subgroup of G that normalizes each N_i then*

$$[X, C_N(B)] \leq (X \cap N)\pi_1 \times \cdots \times (X \cap N)\pi_m.$$

Proof. Note that A permutes $\{ N_1, \ldots, N_m \}$ since this is the set of components of N. For each i, set $A_i = N_A(N_i)$. Now N_i is a simple K-group so [1, Theorem 4.1] implies that the Sylow r-subgroups of $\mathrm{Aut}(K_i)$ are cyclic. Hence $A_i = C_A(N_i)B$. Using [1, Lemma 3.6] we have $C_N(A)\pi_i = C_{N_i}(A_i) = C_{N_i}(B)$ so (a) follows.

(b). Choose $1 \leq i \leq m$, let X be a $BC_{N_i}(B)$-invariant $\mathcal{P}$-subgroup of N_i and set $Y = \langle\ X^A\ \rangle$. Since $A_i = N_A(N_i)$ it follows that Y is the direct product of $|\, A : A_i \,|$ copies of X. Then Y is an A-invariant $\mathcal{P}$-subgroup. Now $C_N(B) = C_{N_1}(B) \times \cdots \times C_{N_m}(B)$. It follows that Y is $C_N(B)$-invariant. Now $C_N(A) \leq C_N(B)$ whence $Y \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A)$. Using Lemma 5.4(c), with B in place of A, we deduce that $O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;B) \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A)$.

To prove the opposite containment, suppose that Z is an $AC_N(A)$-invariant $\mathcal{P}$-subgroup of N. From (a) it follows that each $Z\pi_i$ is a $BC_{N_i}(B)$-invariant of N_i, whence $Z \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(N_1;B) \times \cdots \times O_{\mathcal{P}}(N_m;B)$. Another application of Lemma 5.4(c) implies $Z \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;B)$, completing the proof.

(c). Let $x \in X$ and $c \in C_N(A)$. Then $c = (c\pi_1)\cdots(c\pi_m)$ and, as x normalizes each N_i, it follows that $[x, c\pi_i] \in N_i$. Hence

$$[x,c] = [x,c\pi_1]\cdots[x,c\pi_m].$$

Now $[x,c] \in X \cap N$ so it follows that

$$[x,c]\pi_i = [x,c\pi_i].$$

In particular, $[x,c\pi_i] \in (X \cap N)\pi_i$. Since $C_N(A)\pi_i = C_{N_i}(B)$ we have $[x, C_{N_i}(B)] \leq (X \cap N)\pi_i$. Now $C_N(B) = C_{N_1}(B) \times \cdots \times C_{N_m}(B)$ so the result follows. □

Lemma 5.6. *Suppose that N is an A-invariant normal subgroup of G that is the direct product of nonabelian simple groups and that X is an $AC_N(A)$-invariant subgroup of G. Assume that X and $O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A)$ are $\mathcal{P}$-groups. Then $X \leq N_G(O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A))$.*

Proof. Assume false and consider a counterexample with $|A|$ minimal and then $|G|+|N|+|X|$ minimal. Then $G = XN$. By Coprime Action, $X = C_X(A)[X,A] = \langle\ C_X(B)\ |\ B \in \mathrm{Hyp}(A)\ \rangle$. Since $C_X(A)$ normalizes $O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A)$ it follows that $X = [X,A] = C_X(B)$ for some $B \in \mathrm{Hyp}(A)$. We have

$$N = N_1 \times \cdots \times N_m$$

where each N_i is nonabelian and simple. Then $\{ N_1, \ldots, N_m \}$ is the set of components of N and is hence permuted by AG. Using Lemma 5.4(c) and the minimality of $|N|$ it follows that AX is transitive on $\{ N_1, \ldots, N_m \}$. If N_i is a $\mathcal{P}$-group for some i then so is N, whence $N = O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A)$, contrary to X not normalizing $O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A)$. We deduce that no N_i is a $\mathcal{P}$-group.

Claim 1. *B acts semiregularly on $\{ N_1, \ldots, N_m \}$.*

Proof. Assume false. Set $B_0 = N_B(N_1)$. Then without loss, $B_0 \neq 1$. As $B \leq Z(AX)$ and AX is transitive on $\{ N_1, \ldots, N_m \}$ it follows that B_0 normalizes each N_i. By the same reasoning, either B_0 acts nontrivially on each N_i or trivially on each N_i. The minimality of $|A|$ rules out the latter case since if $[B_0, X] = 1$ then we could replace A by A/B_0. Hence B_0 acts nontrivially on each N_i. Lemma 5.5(b) implies that $O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A) = O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;B_0)$ so as $[X,B_0] = 1$ it follows from Lemma 5.4(a) that X normalizes $O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A)$, a contradiction. □

Claim 2. *Let $1 \leq i \leq m$. Then $|N_A(N_i)| = r$.*

Proof. Without loss, $i = 1$ and $\{ N_1, \ldots, N_l \}$ is the orbit of A on $\{ N_1, \ldots, N_m \}$ that contains N_1. By Claim 1, $N_A(N_1) \cap B = 1$ so as $B \in \mathrm{Hyp}(A)$ it follows that $|N_A(N_1)| = 1$ or r. Suppose, for a contradiction, that $|N_A(N_1)| = 1$. Then A is regular on $\{ N_1, \ldots, N_l \}$. Set $K = N_1 \times \cdots \times N_l$, so that $K \in \mathrm{comp}_A(G)$. [1, Lemma 3.6] implies that $C_K(A) \cong N_1$ and that $C_K(A)$ is maximal subject to being A-invariant. In particular, $C_K(A)$ is not a $\mathcal{P}$-group so Lemma 4.2 implies that X normalizes K. Then $[X, C_K(A)] \leq X \cap K$. Note that K is not a $\mathcal{P}$-group since N_1 is not a $\mathcal{P}$-group, whence $X \cap K < K$. Since $X \cap K$ is $AC_K(A)$-invariant, it follows that $X \cap K \trianglelefteq C_K(A)$. Then as $C_K(A)$ is not a $\mathcal{P}$-group and $C_K(A)$ is simple, we have $X \cap K = 1$. Lemma 4.1 implies that $[X,K] = 1$. Recall that AX is transitive on $\{ N_1, \ldots, N_m \}$ and that $K \in \mathrm{comp}_A(G)$. It follows that $K = N$, whence $[X, O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A)] = 1$, a contradiction. □

Claim 3. *$|A| = r$ and $m = 1$, so N is simple.*

Proof. Consider the permutation action of AX on $\{ N_1, \ldots, N_m \}$. Note that $A \in \mathrm{Syl}_r(AX)$ so it follows from Claim 2 that $N_A(N_i) \in \mathrm{Syl}_r(N_{AX}(N_i))$ for all i. Set $A^* = N_A(N_1)$. Let $1 \leq i \leq m$. Then $N_A(N_i)$ is conjugate in AX to A^*, so as A is abelian, there exists $x \in X$ with $N_A(N_i)^x = A^*$. Now $[N_A(N_i), x] \leq A \cap X = 1$ so we deduce that

$$N_A(N_i) = A^*$$

for all i. Recall that $B \in \mathrm{Hyp}(A)$ so Claims 1 and 2 imply that $A = A^* \times B$. As $X = [X,A] = C_X(B)$ we have $X = [X, A^*]$ and it follows that X normalizes each N_i. Then B is transitive on $\{ N_1, \ldots, N_m \}$ and either A^* is nontrivial on each N_i

or trivial on each N_i. In the latter case, X centralizes N and hence $O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A)$, a contradiction. Thus A^* is nontrivial on each N_i.

We will apply Lemma 5.5, with A^* in the role of B. Put $Y = (X \cap N)\pi_1 \times \cdots \times (X \cap N)\pi_m$. Lemma 5.5(a) implies that Y is $C_N(A^*)$-invariant. Note that XY is a $\mathcal{P}$-group because X normalizes each N_i and hence each $(X \cap N)\pi_i$. Lemma 5.5(c) implies that XY is an $A^*C_N(A^*)$-invariant. Lemma 5.5(b) implies that $O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A) = O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A^*)$ so if $A \neq A^*$, then the minimality of $|\,A\,|$ supplies a contradiction. We deduce that $A = A^*$. Then $|\,A\,| = r$ and $B = 1$. As B is transitive on $\{\, N_1, \ldots, N_m \,\}$, we have $m = 1$. □

It is now straightforward to complete the proof. Note that $X \cap N$ is an $AC_N(A)$-invariant $\mathcal{P}$-subgroup of N and that N is not a $\mathcal{P}$-group. Since N is simple it follows that $(X \cap N)C_N(A) < N$.

Suppose that $X \cap N \leq C_N(A)$. Then $[C_N(A), X, A] \leq [X \cap N, A] = 1$. Trivially $[A, C_N(A), X] = 1$ so the Three Subgroups Lemma forces $[X, A, C_N(A)] = 1$. As $X = [X, A]$ it follows from [1, Theorem 4.4(c)] that $[X, N] = 1$. Then $[X, O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A)] = 1$, a contradiction. We deduce that $X \cap N \not\leq C_N(A)$.

Now [1, Theorem 4.1] implies that $N \cong \mathrm{L}_2(2^r)$ or $\mathrm{Sz}(2^r)$ and that $|\,\mathrm{Out}(N)\,| = r$. Consequently

$$G = XN = C_G(N) \times N.$$

Let α and β be the projections $G \longrightarrow C_G(N)$ and $G \longrightarrow N$ respectively. Then $X \leq X\alpha \times X\beta$ and $X\beta \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A)$. It follows that X normalizes $O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A)$, a contradiction. □

Proof of Theorem 5.2. Assume false and let G be a minimal counterexample. Using Lemma 5.4(a) it follows that $G = O_{\mathcal{P}}(G;A)$ and since $\mathcal{P}$ is closed under extensions we have $O_{\mathcal{P}}(G) = 1$. Let N be a minimal A-invariant normal subgroup of G. Since $G = O_{\mathcal{P}}(G;A)$, the minimality of G implies that G/N is a $\mathcal{P}$-group.

Suppose that N is abelian. Then N is an elementary abelian q-group for some prime q. Now $O_{\mathcal{P}}(G) = 1$ so N is not a $\mathcal{P}$-group. The hypothesis satisfied by $\mathcal{P}$ implies that every $\mathcal{P}$-group is a q'-group. In particular, N is a normal Sylow subgroup of G. [1, Coprime Action(g)] implies there exists an A-invariant complement H to N, so $G = HN$ and $H \cap N = 1$. Let P be an $AC_G(A)$-invariant $\mathcal{P}$-subgroup of G and set $G_0 = PN$. Then $G_0 = (G_0 \cap H)N$ and P and $G_0 \cap H$ are A-invariant complements to N in G_0. [1, Coprime Action(g)] implies $P^c = G_0 \cap H$ for some $c \in C_{G_0}(A)$. Since P is $AC_G(A)$-invariant we obtain $P \leq H$. Then $G = O_{\mathcal{P}}(G;A) \leq H$, a contradiction. We deduce that N is nonabelian. Then N is a direct product of simple groups.

Suppose that $N \neq G$. Then $O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A)$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group by the minimality of G. Now $G = O_{\mathcal{P}}(G;A)$ so Lemma 5.6 implies $O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A) \trianglelefteq G$. As $O_{\mathcal{P}}(G) = 1$ this forces $O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A) = 1$. Let P be an $AC_G(A)$-invariant $\mathcal{P}$-subgroup of G. Then $P \cap N \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A) = 1$. Since N is A-invariant and the direct product of simple groups, it is the direct product of the A-components of G. Lemma 4.1 implies $[P, N] = 1$. But $G = O_{\mathcal{P}}(G;A)$ whence $N \leq Z(G)$, a contradiction. We deduce that $N = G$. Moreover, since N is a minimal A-invariant normal subgroup of G, it follows that G is A-simple.

Recall the definitions of underdiagonal and overdiagonal subgroups of G as given in [1, §6]. Let P be an $AC_G(A)$-invariant $\mathcal{P}$-subgroup of G and suppose that P is

overdiagonal. Then each component of G is a $\mathcal{P}$-group, so G is a $\mathcal{P}$-group, a contradiction. We deduce that every $AC_G(A)$-invariant $\mathcal{P}$-subgroup of G is underdiagonal. [1, Lemma 6.8(b)] implies that G possesses a unique maximal $AC_G(A)$-invariant underdiagonal subgroup. Thus $G \neq O_{\mathcal{P}}(G;A)$. This final contradiction completes the proof. □

6. Near $(A,\mathcal{P})$-subgroups

Throughout this section we assume the following.

Hypothesis 6.1.

- *r is a prime and A is an elementary abelian r-group.*
- *A acts coprimely on the K-group G.*
- *$\mathcal{P}$ is a group theoretic property that is closed under subgroups, quotients and extensions.*
- *Every solvable group is a $\mathcal{P}$-group.*

Definition 6.2.

- G is a *near $(A,\mathcal{P})$-group* if $C_G(A)$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group.
- $O_{n\mathcal{P}}(G) = \langle\, N \trianglelefteq G \mid N$ is A-invariant and a near $(A,\mathcal{P})$-group $\rangle$.
- $O_{n\mathcal{P}}(G;A) = \langle\, H \leq G \mid H$ is $AC_G(A)$-invariant and a near $(A,\mathcal{P})$-group $\rangle$.

Lemma 6.3.

(a) *$O_{n\mathcal{P}}(G)$ is a near $(A,\mathcal{P})$-group.*
(b) *Suppose $N \trianglelefteq G$ is A-invariant and that N and G/N are near $(A,\mathcal{P})$-groups. Then so is G.*

Proof. (a). Suppose that $N, M \trianglelefteq G$ are A-invariant near $(A,\mathcal{P})$-groups. Coprime Action implies that $C_{NM}(A) = C_N(A)C_M(A)$ so as $C_N(A)$ and $C_M(A)$ normalize each other, the assumptions on $\mathcal{P}$ imply that $C_N(A)$ and $C_M(A)$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group. Thus NM is a near $(A,\mathcal{P})$-group and the result follows.

(b). Because $\mathcal{P}$ is closed under extensions. □

The main aim of this section is to prove the following.

Theorem 6.4.

(a) *$O_{n\mathcal{P}}(G;A)$ is a near $(A,\mathcal{P})$-group.*
(b) *Suppose that N is an A-invariant normal subgroup of G then $O_{n\mathcal{P}}(N;A) = O_{n\mathcal{P}}(G;A) \cap N$.*
(c) *Suppose that H is an $AC_G(A)$-invariant subgroup of G then $O_{\mathcal{P},E}(H)$ normalizes $O_{n\mathcal{P}}(G;A)$.*

Lemma 6.5. *Suppose that G is A-simple and that $X \neq 1$ is an $AC_G(A)$-invariant near $(A,\mathcal{P})$-subgroup of G. Then G is a near $(A,\mathcal{P})$-group.*

Proof. Suppose first that $\mathrm{sol}(X) \neq 1$. Then G possesses a nontrivial $AC_G(A)$-invariant solvable subgroup. [1, Theorem 4.1(c)] implies that $C_G(A)$ is solvable. By hypothesis, every solvable group is a $\mathcal{P}$-group so G is a near $(A,\mathcal{P})$-group. Hence we may assume that $\mathrm{sol}(X) = 1$. Moreover, by considering $C_X(A)$ in place of X, we may assume that $\mathrm{sol}(C_X(A)) = 1$.

Since $\mathrm{sol}(X) = 1$, [1, Theorem 4.4(a)] implies $C_X(A) \neq 1$, so as $\mathrm{sol}(C_X(A)) = 1$ we have $1 \neq E(C_X(A)) \trianglelefteq C_G(A)$. Now G is an A-simple K-group and $C_G(A)$ is nonsolvable so $F^*(C_G(A))$ is A-simple and $C_G(A)/F^*(C_G(A))$ is solvable by [1, Theorem 6.5(a),(b) and Theorem 4.1]. Then $E(C_X(A)) = F^*(C_G(A))$ so $F^*(C_G(A))$ is

a $\mathcal{P}$-group. Since $C_G(A)/F^*(C_G(A))$ is solvable, the hypothesis on $\mathcal{P}$ implies that $C_G(A)$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group. Then G is a near $(A,\mathcal{P})$-group. □

Corollary 6.6. *Suppose that X is an $AC_G(A)$-invariant near $(A,\mathcal{P})$-subgroup of G and that $L \in \mathrm{comp}_A(G)$ with $Z(L) = 1$. Then $[X,L] = 1$ or L is a near $(A,\mathcal{P})$-group.*

Proof. Assume $[X,L] \neq 1$. Lemma 4.1 implies that $X \cap L \neq 1$ so as $X \cap L$ is an $AC_L(A)$-invariant near $(A,\mathcal{P})$-subgroup of L, the result follows. □

Proof of Theorem 6.4. (a). Assume false and let G be a minimal counterexample. Then $G = O_{n\mathcal{P}}(G;A), O_{n\mathcal{P}}(G) = 1, \mathrm{sol}(G) = 1$ and $G/E(G)$ is a near $(A,\mathcal{P})$-group. It follows that $E(G)$ is not a near $(A,\mathcal{P})$-group and that there exists $L \in \mathrm{comp}_A(G)$ such that L is not a near $(A,\mathcal{P})$-group. Note that $Z(L) \leq \mathrm{sol}(G) = 1$. As $G = O_{n\mathcal{P}}(G;A)$, Corollary 6.6 implies $L \leq Z(G)$, a contradiction.

(b). Since $O_{n\mathcal{P}}(G;A) \cap N$ is a near $(A,\mathcal{P})$-group we have $O_{n\mathcal{P}}(G;A) \cap N \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A)$. Now $C_G(A)$ permutes the $AC_N(A)$-invariant near $(A,\mathcal{P})$-subgroups of N so $C_G(A)$ normalizes $O_{\mathcal{P}}(N;A)$. Thus $O_{n\mathcal{P}}(N;A) \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(G;A) \cap N$, completing the proof.

(c). Since $O_{n\mathcal{P}}(G) \leq O_{n\mathcal{P}}(G;A)$ we may pass to the quotient $G/O_{n\mathcal{P}}(G)$ and assume that $O_{n\mathcal{P}}(G) = 1$. Now every solvable group is a $\mathcal{P}$-group so $\mathrm{sol}(G) = 1$ and hence $C_G(E(G)) = 1$. Let

$$\mathcal{C}_n = \{\ K \in \mathrm{comp}_A(G) \mid K \text{ is a near } (A,\mathcal{P})\text{-group}\ \}$$
$$\mathcal{C}_0 = \mathrm{comp}_A(G) - \mathcal{C}_n.$$

Corollary 6.6 implies that $O_{n\mathcal{P}}(G;A)$ centralizes $\langle\ \mathcal{C}_0\ \rangle$. Then $O_{n\mathcal{P}}(G;A)$ normalizes $\langle\ \mathcal{C}_n\ \rangle = C_{E(G)}(\langle\ \mathcal{C}_0\ \rangle)$. As $C_G(E(G)) = 1$ we also have $\mathcal{C}_n \neq \emptyset$.

Suppose $L \in \mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathcal{P}}(H)$. We claim that L acts trivially on $\mathcal{C}_0$. If $L \leq E(G)$ then the claim is trivial so suppose $L \not\leq E(G)$. Now every solvable group is a $\mathcal{P}$-group so $O_{\mathcal{P}}(L)$ is the unique maximal A-invariant normal subgroup of L. Consequently $L \cap E(G) \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(L)$. Now $E(G) \cap HC_G(A) \trianglelefteq HC_G(A)$ so Theorem 3.4(d) implies that $E(G) \cap HC_G(A)$ normalizes L. Let $K \in \mathcal{C}_0$. Then $C_K(A) \leq N_G(L)$. Since $K \cap L \leq L \cap E(G) \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(L)$, Lemma 6.5 implies $K \cap L = 1$, whence $[K,L] = 1$ by Lemma 4.1. This establishes the claim. We deduce that $E_{\mathcal{P}}(H)$ normalizes $\langle\ \mathcal{C}_0\ \rangle$ and also normalizes $\langle\ \mathcal{C}_n\ \rangle = C_{E(G)}(\langle\ \mathcal{C}_0\ \rangle)$. We have previously seen that $O_{n\mathcal{P}}(G;A)$ normalizes $\langle\ \mathcal{C}_n\ \rangle$ so as $O_{\mathcal{P}}(H) \leq O_{n\mathcal{P}}(G;A)$ we have that

$$\langle\ O_{\mathcal{P},E}(H), O_{n\mathcal{P}}(G;A), C_G(A)\ \rangle \leq N_G(\langle\ \mathcal{C}_n\ \rangle).$$

Since $O_{n\mathcal{P}}(G) = 1$, the normalizer is a proper subgroup of G. The conclusion follows by induction. □

7. Local to global results

We shall generalize some of the results of [1, §9] concerning A-components to $(A,\mathcal{P})$-components. Consider the following:

Hypothesis 7.1.

- *r is a prime and A is an elementary abelian r-group that acts coprimely on the K-group G.*
- *$\mathcal{P}$ is a group theoretic property that satisfies Hypothesis 2.1.*
- *H is an $AC_G(A)$-invariant subgroup of G.*

The aim is to establish a connection between the $(A, \mathcal{P})$-components of H and the structure of G. This is not possible in full generality, but if additional assumptions are made then it is.

Hypothesis 7.2.

- *Hypothesis 7.1.*
- *Every $\mathcal{P}$-group is solvable.*
- *$a \in A^{\#}$ and H is $C_G(a)$-invariant.*

Hypothesis 7.3.

- *Hypothesis 7.1.*
- *Whenever A acts coprimely on the K-group X and $C_X(A)$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group then X is solvable.*

Lemma 7.4.

(a) *Assume Hypothesis 7.1. If $\mathcal{P}$ is any of the properties "is trivial", "is nilpotent" or "has odd order" then Hypothesis 7.3 is satisfied.*
(b) *Assume Hypothesis 7.3. Then every $\mathcal{P}$-group is solvable.*

Proof. (a). This follows from [1, Theorem 4.4].
(b). Let X be a $\mathcal{P}$-group and let A act trivially on X. □

We state the main result of this section.

Theorem 7.5.

(a) *Assume Hypothesis 7.2 and that $K \in \mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathcal{P}}(H)$ satisfies $K = [K, a]$. Then $K \in \mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathcal{P}}(G)$.*
(b) *Assume Hypothesis 7.3. Then $O_{\mathcal{P}}(H)E_{\mathcal{P}}(H)$ acts trivially on $\mathrm{comp}_{\mathrm{sol}}(G)$. If $K \in \mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathcal{P}}(H)$ then there exists a unique $\widetilde{K} \in \mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathrm{sol}}(G)$ with $K \leq \widetilde{K}$.*

At the end of this section, examples will be constructed to show that the additional hypothesis in (b) is needed. It would be interesting to investigate if (a) holds without the solvability hypothesis. Two lemmas are required for the proof of Theorem 7.5.

Lemma 7.6. *Assume Hypothesis 7.1, that $K \in \mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathcal{P}}(H)$ and that*

(a) *$K \leq E(G)$, or*
(b) *$\mathrm{sol}(G) = 1$ and K acts trivially on $\mathrm{comp}(G)$.*

Then there exists a unique $\widetilde{K} \in \mathrm{comp}_A(G)$ with $K \leq \widetilde{K}$.

Proof. Uniqueness is clear since distinct elements of $\mathrm{comp}_A(G)$ have solvable intersection. Note that since H is $C_G(A)$-invariant we have $K \in \mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathcal{P}}(HC_G(A))$. Hence we may assume that $C_G(A) \leq H$.

Suppose (a) holds. Assume the conclusion to be false. Let $L \in \mathrm{comp}_A(G)$. Now $L \cap H \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq H$ and $K \not\leq L$ so Lemma 3.4(d) implies $[K, L \cap H] \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$. As $C_L(A) \leq H$ we have $[K, C_L(A)] \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$ and $C_L(A)$ normalizes K. Since $C_{E(G)}(A)$ is the product of the subgroups $C_L(A)$ as L ranges over $\mathrm{comp}_A(G)$, it follows that $[K, C_{E(G)}(A)] \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$.

By hypothesis, $K \leq E(G)$ so $[K, C_K(A)] \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$. Hence $O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)C_K(A) \trianglelefteq K$ and Coprime Action implies that A is fixed point free on $K/O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)C_K(A)$. This quotient is therefore solvable by [1, Theorem 4.4]. Since K is perfect, it follows

that $K = O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)C_K(A)$. But $[K, C_K(A)] \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$ so $K/O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$ is abelian. This contradiction completes the proof.

Suppose (b) holds. Let N be the intersection of the normalizers of the components of G. Since $\mathrm{sol}(G) = 1$ we have $C_G(E(G)) = 1$ and then the Schreier Property implies that $N/E(G)$ is solvable. Now K is perfect and $K \leq N$ whence $K \leq E(G)$. Apply (a). □

Lemma 7.7. *Assume Hypothesis 7.1 and that $L \in \mathrm{comp}_A(G)$. Then:*

(a) *$O_{\mathcal{P}}(H)E_{\mathcal{P}}(H)$ normalizes L and every component of L; or*
(b) *$C_{L/Z(L)}(A)$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group.*

Proof. Suppose that $O_{\mathcal{P}}(H)E_{\mathcal{P}}(H) \leq N_G(L)$. Then $AO_{\mathcal{P}}(H)E_{\mathcal{P}}(H)$ permutes $\mathrm{comp}(L)$. Since A is transitive and $O_{\mathcal{P}}(H)E_{\mathcal{P}}(H)$ is a normal Hall-subgroup of $AO_{\mathcal{P}}(H)E_{\mathcal{P}}(H)$, [1, Lemma 3.8] implies that $O_{\mathcal{P}}(H)E_{\mathcal{P}}(H)$ acts trivially. Then (a) holds.

Suppose that $O_{\mathcal{P}}(H) \not\leq N_G(L)$. Now $C_L(A) \leq N_G(H)$ so $[O_{\mathcal{P}}(H), C_L(A)] \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(H)$. In particular, the commutator is a $\mathcal{P}$-group. Lemma 4.2 implies that $C_{L/Z(L)}(A)$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group.

Suppose that $E_{\mathcal{P}}(H) \not\leq N_G(L)$. Choose $K \in \mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathcal{P}}(H)$ with $K \not\leq N_G(L)$. Set $H_0 = HC_G(A)$ so $H \trianglelefteq H_0$ and $K \in \mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathcal{P}}(H_0)$. Now $L \cap H_0 \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq H_0$ so Lemma 2.4(d) implies $K \leq L \cap H_0$ or $[K, L \cap H_0] \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(K)$. The first possibility does not hold since $K \not\leq N_G(L)$. Moreover, $C_L(A) \leq L \cap H_0$ so we deduce that $[K, C_L(A)]$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group. Lemma 4.2, with K and L in the roles of P and K respectively, implies that $C_{L/Z(L)}(A)$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group. □

Proof of Theorem 7.5. (a). Now $K \in \mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathcal{P}}(C_G(a)H)$ because $C_G(a)$ normalizes H. Hence we may assume that $C_G(a) \leq H$. Now $K = K_1 * \cdots * K_n$ where $K_1, \ldots, K_n$ are the $\langle\ a\ \rangle$-components of K. As $K = [K, a]$ it follows that $K_i = [K_i, a]$ for each i. If $K_i \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq G$ for each i then $K \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq G$ and then $K \in \mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathcal{P}}(G)$. Hence, as Hypothesis 7.2 remains valid if A is replaced by $\langle\ a\ \rangle$, we may assume that $A = \langle\ a\ \rangle$.

Consider first the case that $\mathrm{sol}(G) = 1$. Assume that K acts nontrivially on $\mathrm{comp}(G)$. Then the set

$$\mathcal{C} = \{\ L_0 \in \mathrm{comp}(G) \mid K \not\leq N_G(L_0)\ \}$$

is nonempty. Since A normalizes K it follows that A acts on $\mathcal{C}$. Now $K = [K, a]$ so it follows also that a acts nontrivially. Choose $L_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ with $L_0 \neq L_0^a$. Set $L = \langle\ L_0^A\ \rangle \in \mathrm{comp}_A(G)$. Now L_0 is simple because $\mathrm{sol}(G) = 1$ so as $A = \langle\ a\ \rangle$ we see that L is the direct product of r copies of L_0 and then that $C_L(A) \cong L_0$. By hypothesis, every $\mathcal{P}$-group is solvable, so $C_L(A)$ is not $\mathcal{P}$-group. Lemma 7.7 implies that K normalizes L and L_0, a contradiction. We deduce that K acts trivially on $\mathrm{comp}(G)$.

Lemma 7.6 implies there exists $\widetilde{K}$ with $K \leq \widetilde{K} \in \mathrm{comp}_A(G)$. Now $C_{\widetilde{K}}(a) \leq H \cap \widetilde{K}$ and $K = [K, a] \leq H \cap \widetilde{K}$ so $C_{\widetilde{K}}(a) < H \cap \widetilde{K}$. [1, Corollary 6.9] implies $H \cap \widetilde{K} = \widetilde{K}$. Then $K \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq \widetilde{K}$. Since $\widetilde{K}$ is A-simple we obtain $K = \widetilde{K}$ and so $K \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq G$ as desired.

Returning now to the general case, set $S = \mathrm{sol}(G)$. Applying the previous argument to G/S, we obtain $KS \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq G$. Now $C_S(a) \leq S \cap H \leq \mathrm{sol}(H)$ so Lemma 2.4(i) implies $C_S(a) \leq N_G(K)$. Then [1, Lemma 8.3] implies $S \leq N_G(K)$ whence $K \trianglelefteq\trianglelefteq G$ and $K \in \mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathcal{P}}(G)$ as required.

(b). As in (a) we may suppose that $C_G(A) \leq H$. Consider first the case that $\mathrm{sol}(G) = 1$. If $L \in \mathrm{comp}_A(G)$ then L is nonsolvable so by hypothesis, $C_L(A)$ is not a $\mathcal{P}$-group. Lemma 7.7 implies that $O_{\mathcal{P}}(H)E_{\mathcal{P}}(H)$ normalizes L and every component of L. Since every component of G is contained in an A-component of G, it follows that $O_{\mathcal{P}}(H)E_{\mathcal{P}}(H)$ acts trivially on $\mathrm{comp}(G)$. Lemma 7.6(b) implies there exists $\widetilde{K}$ with $K \leq \widetilde{K} \in \mathrm{comp}_A(G)$.

Returning to the general case, set $S = \mathrm{sol}(G)$ and $\overline{G} = G/S$. The map $X \mapsto \overline{X}$ is a bijection $\mathrm{comp}_{\mathrm{sol}}(G) \longrightarrow \mathrm{comp}(G)$. It follows that $O_{\mathcal{P}}(H)E_{\mathcal{P}}(H)$ acts trivially on $\mathrm{comp}_{\mathrm{sol}}(G)$. By the previous paragraph and Lemma 3.4(j) there exists $M \in \mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathrm{sol}}(G)$ with $\overline{K} \leq \overline{M}$. Then $K \leq M\,\mathrm{sol}(G)$. Lemma 3.4(i) implies $M \trianglelefteq M\,\mathrm{sol}(G)$ whence $K = K^\infty \leq (M\,\mathrm{sol}(G))^\infty = M$ and the proof is complete. □

We close this section with a corollary and an example. In what follows, *nil* is an abbreviation for the group theoretic property "is nilpotent".

Corollary 7.8. *Let A be an elementary abelian r-group that acts coprimely on the K-group G. Let $a \in A^\#$ and suppose that H is an $AC_G(a)$-invariant subgroup of G.*

(a) *Let $K \in \mathrm{comp}_A(H)$. Then there exists $\widetilde{K}$ with*

$$K \leq \widetilde{K} \in \mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathrm{nil}}(G).$$

(b) *Let $K \in \mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathrm{nil}}(H)$. Then there exists $\widetilde{K}$ with*

$$K \leq \widetilde{K} \in \mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathrm{sol}}(G).$$

Proof. (a) follows from [1, Theorem 9.1] and (b) follows from Lemma 7.4 and Theorem 7.5(a). □

The following example shows that the corollary cannot be extended further and that the restriction on $\mathcal{P}$ in Theorem 7.5(b) is needed.

Example 7.9. Let r be a prime and J_1 be a simple r'-group that admits an automorphism a_1 of order r with $C_{J_1}(a_1)$ solvable. For example $\mathrm{L}_2(2^r)$ or $\mathrm{Sz}(2^r)$ with $r > 5$. Let K be a simple group with order n. Then K acts on the direct product

$$D = J_1\langle\, a_1 \,\rangle \times J_2\langle\, a_2 \,\rangle \times \cdots \times J_n\langle\, a_n \,\rangle$$

permuting the direct factors regularly. Set $a = a_1a_2\cdots a_n \in C_D(K)$ and put $A = \langle\, a \,\rangle$. Let G be the semidirect product

$$G = (J_1 \times \cdots \times J_n) \rtimes K.$$

Then a acts on G with $C_G(a) = (C_{J_1}(a_1) \times \cdots \times C_{J_n}(a_n))K$. Observe that K is contained in an (A, sol)-component of $C_G(a)$. However, the (A, sol)-components of G are $J_1, \ldots, J_n$, none of which contain K.

8. The McBride Dichotomy

In this section we give an application of §6 to the study of Signalizer Functors. No originality is claimed, the results being a presentation of McBride's work [4, Theorem 6.6]. They culminate in a fundamental dichotomy in the proof of the Nonsolvable Signalizer Functor Theorem.

Throughout this section, we assume the following.

Hypothesis 8.1.

(a) *$\mathcal{P}$ is a group theoretic property that is closed under subgroups, quotients and extensions.*
(b) *Every solvable group is a $\mathcal{P}$-group.*

We will be interested in the subgroup $O_{\mathcal{P},E}(H)$ for groups H. Note that

$$O_{\mathcal{P},E}(H) = O_{\mathcal{P}}(H)E_{\mathcal{P}}(H).$$

Lemma 8.2. *Let G be a group.*

(a) *Suppose $H \leq G$ and $O_{\mathcal{P},E}(G) \leq H$. Then $O_{\mathcal{P},E}(G) = O_{\mathcal{P},E}(H)$.*
(b) *Suppose $H, M \leq G$, $O_{\mathcal{P},E}(H) \leq M$ and $O_{\mathcal{P},E}(M) \leq H$. Then $O_{\mathcal{P},E}(H) = O_{\mathcal{P},E}(M)$.*

Proof. (a). Set $\overline{G} = G/O_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$. Then

$$E(\overline{G}) = \overline{O_{\mathcal{P},E}(G)} \leq \overline{H}.$$

Since $\mathcal{P}$ is closed under extensions we have $O_{\mathcal{P}}(\overline{G}) = 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}[O_{\mathcal{P}}(\overline{H}), E(\overline{G})] &\leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(\overline{H}) \cap E(\overline{G}) \\ &\leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(E(\overline{G})) \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(\overline{G}) = 1.\end{aligned}$$

Now every solvable group is a $\mathcal{P}$-group so $\mathrm{sol}(\overline{G}) = 1$ and hence $C_{\overline{G}}(E(\overline{G})) = 1$. Then $O_{\mathcal{P}}(\overline{H}) = 1$ and $O_{\mathcal{P}}(H) \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$. Since $O_{\mathcal{P}}(G) \leq H$ it follows that $O_{\mathcal{P}}(H) = O_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$. As $E(\overline{G}) \leq \overline{H}$ we have $E(\overline{G}) \trianglelefteq E(\overline{H})$. Then any component of $\overline{H}$ not contained in $E(\overline{G})$ would centralize $E(\overline{G})$, contrary to $C_{\overline{G}}(E(\overline{G})) = 1$. We deduce that $E(\overline{G}) = E(\overline{H})$ and the conclusion follows.

(b). Observe that $O_{\mathcal{P},E}(H) = O_{\mathcal{P},E}(H \cap M) = O_{\mathcal{P},E}(M)$. □

We remark that (b) is an elementary version of Bender's Maximal Subgroup Theorem.

Lemma 8.3. *Let r be a prime and A be a noncyclic elementary abelian r-group that acts coprimely on the K-group G. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}O_{\mathcal{P},E}(G) &= O_{\mathcal{P},E}(\langle\, O_{\mathcal{P},E}(C_G(B)) \mid B \in \mathrm{Hyp}(A) \,\rangle) \\ &= O_{\mathcal{P},E}(\langle\, O_{\mathcal{P},E}(C_G(a)) \mid a \in A^{\#} \,\rangle).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let H be either right hand side. Coprime Action implies that $O_{\mathcal{P}}(G) \leq H$. Passing to the quotient $G/O_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ and applying [1, Lemma 6.12] it follows that $O_{\mathcal{P},E}(G) \leq H$. Apply Lemma 8.2(a). □

Throughout the remainder of this section we assume the following.

Hypothesis 8.4.

(a) *Hypothesis 8.1.*
(b) *r is a prime and A is an elementary abelian r-group with rank at least 3.*
(c) *A acts on the group G.*
(d) *θ is an A-signalizer functor on G.*
(e) *$\theta(a)$ is a K-group for all $a \in A^{\#}$.*
(f) *$\widetilde{G} = \langle\, \theta(a) \mid a \in A^{\#} \,\rangle$.*

Lemma 8.5. $\widetilde{G} = \langle\, \theta(B) \mid B \in \mathrm{Hyp}(A) \,\rangle$.

Proof. Let $a \in A^{\#}$. Coprime Action applied to the action of $A/\langle\, a \,\rangle$ on $\theta(a)$ implies that

$$\theta(a) = \langle\, \theta(a) \cap C_G(B) \mid a \in B \in \mathrm{Hyp}(A) \,\rangle.$$

Now $\theta(a) \cap C_G(B) = \theta(B)$ whenever $a \in B \in \mathrm{Hyp}(A)$ so the conclusion follows. □

Lemma 8.6. *Let*

$$H_1 = \langle\, O_{\mathcal{P},E}(\theta(a)) \mid a \in A^{\#} \,\rangle$$

and

$$H_2 = \langle\, O_{\mathcal{P},E}(\theta(B)) \mid B \in \mathrm{Hyp}(A) \,\rangle.$$

Let $i \in \{\, 1, 2 \,\}$ and suppose that H_i is contained in a θ-subgroup. Then H_i is a θ-subgroup and $O_{\mathcal{P},E}(H_1) \trianglelefteq \widetilde{G}$.

Proof. Since any A-invariant subgroup of a θ-subgroup is a θ-subgroup, the first assertion holds. Suppose $i = 1$. Let $B \in \mathrm{Hyp}(A)$. Lemma 8.3, with B in the role of A, implies that

$$O_{\mathcal{P},E}(H_1) = O_{\mathcal{P},E}(\langle\, O_{\mathcal{P},E}(C_{H_1}(b)) \mid b \in B^{\#} \,\rangle).$$

Let $b \in B^{\#}$. Since H_1 is a θ-subgroup we have $O_{\mathcal{P},E}(\theta(b)) \leq C_{H_1}(b) \leq \theta(b)$. Lemma 8.2(a) implies that

$$O_{\mathcal{P},E}(\theta(b)) = O_{\mathcal{P},E}(C_{H_1}(b)).$$

Note that $\theta(B) \leq \theta(b)$ so $\theta(B)$ normalizes $O_{\mathcal{P},E}(\theta(b))$. It follows that $\theta(B)$ normalizes $O_{\mathcal{P},E}(H_1)$. Then Lemma 8.5 implies that $O_{\mathcal{P},E}(H_1) \trianglelefteq \widetilde{G}$.

Suppose $i = 2$. Let $a \in A^{\#}$. Lemma 8.3 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} O_{\mathcal{P},E}(\theta(a)) &= O_{\mathcal{P},E}(\langle\, O_{\mathcal{P},E}(\theta(a) \cap C_G(B)) \mid a \in B \in \mathrm{Hyp}(A) \,\rangle) \\ &= O_{\mathcal{P},E}(\langle\, O_{\mathcal{P},E}(\theta(B)) \mid B \in \mathrm{Hyp}(A) \,\rangle) \\ &\leq H_2. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $H_1 \leq H_2$, so apply the previous case. □

For each $a \in A^{\#}$, define

$$\theta_{n\mathcal{P}}(a) = O_{n\mathcal{P}}(\theta(a); A).$$

Theorem 6.4 implies that $\theta_{n\mathcal{P}}$ is an A-signalizer functor on G.

Lemma 8.7. *Assume that $\theta_{n\mathcal{P}}$ is complete. Then*

$$O_{\mathcal{P},E}(\theta(B)) \leq N_G(\theta_{n\mathcal{P}}(G))$$

for all $B \in \mathrm{Hyp}(A)$.

Proof. Set $S = \theta_{n\mathcal{P}}(G)$ and let $b \in B^{\#}$. Then

$$C_S(b) = \theta_{n\mathcal{P}}(b) = O_{n\mathcal{P}}(\theta(b); A).$$

Now $\theta(B) \leq \theta(b)$ so Theorem 6.4(c) implies $O_{\mathcal{P},E}(\theta(B))$ normalizes $O_{n\mathcal{P}}(\theta(b); A)$. Since $S = \langle\, C_S(b) \mid b \in B^{\#} \,\rangle$, the result follows. □

Theorem 8.8 (The McBride Dichotomy)**.** *Suppose that θ is a minimal counterexample to the Nonsolvable Signalizer Functor Theorem.*

(a) *Either $\theta_{n\mathcal{P}} = 1$ or $\theta = \theta_{n\mathcal{P}}$.*
(b) *Either*

- *There exist no nontrivial $\theta(A)$-invariant solvable θ-subgroups; or*
- *$\theta(A)$ is solvable and every nonsolvable composition factor of every θ-subgroup belongs to $\{ \mathrm{L}_2(2^r), \mathrm{L}_2(3^r), \mathrm{U}_3(2^r), \mathrm{Sz}(2^r) \}$.*

Proof. Note that minimality is with reference to the integer

$$|\,\theta\,| = \sum_{a \in A^\#} |\,\theta(a)\,|.$$

Since θ is a minimal counterexample, it follows that $G = \widetilde{G}$ and that no nontrivial θ-subgroup is normal in G.

(a). Suppose that $\theta_{n\mathcal{P}}$ is complete and that $\theta_{n\mathcal{P}} \neq 1$. Set $S = \theta_{n\mathcal{P}}(G)$. Then S is a θ-subgroup so $N_G(S) \neq G$ and hence $N_G(S)$ possesses a unique maximal θ-subgroup, $\theta(N_G(S))$. Lemmas 8.7 and 8.6 supply a contradiction. We deduce that either $\theta_{n\mathcal{P}}$ is not complete, in which case $\theta = \theta_{n\mathcal{P}}$; or $\theta_{n\mathcal{P}}(G) = 1$, in which case $\theta_{n\mathcal{P}} = 1$.

(b). Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the group theoretic property "is solvable". Suppose that $\theta_{n\mathcal{P}} = 1$. Let X be a $\theta(A)$-invariant solvable θ-subgroup. Let $a \in A^\#$. Then, as $C_X(A)$ is solvable, we have $C_X(a) \leq O_{n\mathcal{P}}(\theta(a); A) = \theta_{n\mathcal{P}}(a) = 1$. Since A is noncyclic, it follows that $X = 1$, so the first assertion holds. Suppose that $\theta = \theta_{n\mathcal{P}}$. Let $a \in A^\#$. Then $\theta(A) = C_{\theta(a)}(A) = C_{\theta_{n\mathcal{P}}(a)}(A)$ so $\theta(A)$ is solvable. Let X be a θ-subgroup. Then $C_X(A) \leq \theta(A)$ so $C_X(A)$ is solvable. The conclusion follows from [1, Theorem 4.4]. □

9. A theorem of Gorenstein and Lyons

We will provide an alternate proof of a special case of the Nonsolvable Signalizer Functor Theorem due to Gorenstein and Lyons [3]. It is an application of the main result of §5. Throughout this section, we assume the following.

Hypothesis 9.1.

- *r is a prime and A is an elementary abelian r-group with rank at least 3.*
- *A acts on the group G.*
- *θ is an A-signalizer functor on G.*
- *$\theta(a)$ is a K-group for all $a \in A^\#$.*

We shall prove:

Theorem 9.2 (Gorenstein-Lyons)**.** *Assume that A acts trivially on $\mathrm{comp}_{\mathrm{sol}}(\theta(a))$ for all $a \in A^\#$. Then θ is complete.*

First we develop a little general theory.

Definition 9.3. A *subfunctor* of θ is an A-signalizer functor ψ on G with $\psi(a) \leq \theta(a)$ for all $a \in A^\#$. We say that ψ is a *proper subfunctor* if $\psi(a) \neq \theta(a)$ for some $a \in A^\#$ and that ψ is $\theta(A)$-*invariant* if $\psi(a)$ is normalized by $\theta(A)$ for all $a \in A^\#$.

Lemma 9.4. *Let $t \in A^\#$, set $D = \langle\, C_{[\theta(a),t]}(t) \mid a \in A^\# \,\rangle$ and define ψ by*

$$\psi(a) = [\theta(a), t](\theta(a) \cap D)$$

for all $a \in A^\#$.

(a) *ψ is a $\theta(A)$-invariant subfunctor of θ.*
(b) *If ψ is complete then so is θ.*

Proof. (a). Let $a \in A^\#$. Then $C_{[\theta(a),t]}(t)$ is $A\theta(A)$-invariant since $\theta(a)$ and t are. Thus D is $A\theta(A)$-invariant. Now $[\theta(a), t] \trianglelefteq \theta(a)$ so $\psi(a)$ is a subgroup of $\theta(a)$. Again, it is $A\theta(A)$-invariant. Let $b \in A^\#$. By [1, Coprime Action(e)],

$$\psi(a) \cap C_G(b) = C_{[\theta(a),t]}(b)C_{\theta(a)\cap D}(b).$$

Set $X = C_{[\theta(a),t]}(b)$. Then $X \leq \theta(a) \cap C_G(b) \leq \theta(b)$. By [1, Coprime Action(a)] we have

$$X = [X, t]C_X(t) \leq \langle\, [\theta(b), t], \theta(b) \cap C_{[\theta(a),t]}(t) \,\rangle \leq \psi(b).$$

Trivially, $C_{\theta(a)\cap D}(b) \leq \theta(b) \cap D \leq \psi(b)$. We conclude that $\psi(a) \cap C_G(b) \leq \psi(b)$, so ψ is an A-signalizer functor.

(b). This is [2, Corollary 4.3] □

Lemma 9.5. *Suppose that:*

(i) *θ is incomplete.*

(ii) *ψ is complete whenever ψ is a proper $\theta(A)$-invariant subfunctor of θ.*

Then the following hold:

(a) *For each $t \in A^\#$,*

$$\theta(t) = \langle\, C_{[\theta(a),t]}(t) \mid a \in A^\# \,\rangle.$$

(b) *Let*

$$\mathcal{S} = \{\, S \mid S \text{ is a simple section of } C_{[\theta(a),t]}(t) \text{ for some } a, t \in A^\# \,\}$$

and let $\mathcal{P}$ be the group theoretic property defined by:

H is a $\mathcal{P}$-group if and only if every noncyclic composition factor of H is isomorphic to a member of $\mathcal{S}$.

Then $\theta(t)$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group for all $t \in A^\#$.

Proof. (a). Adopt the notation defined in the statement of Lemma 9.5. Since θ is incomplete, it follows from (ii) and Lemma 9.4 that $\theta = \psi$. Then $\theta(t) = \psi(t) = [\theta(t), t](\theta(t) \cap D) = D$.

(b). For each $a \in A^\#$, $C_{[\theta(a),t]}(t)$ is an $A\theta(A)$-invariant $\mathcal{P}$-subgroup of $\theta(t)$. Now $\theta(A) = C_{\theta(t)}(A)$ so Theorem 5.2 implies that $\langle\, C_{[\theta(a),t]}(t) \mid a \in A^\# \,\rangle$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group. Then (a) implies that $\theta(t)$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group. □

Lemma 9.6. *Suppose that A acts on the K-group H, that $t \in A^\#$ and that t acts trivially on $\mathrm{comp}_{\mathrm{sol}}(H)$. Then t acts trivially on $\mathrm{comp}_{\mathrm{sol}}(M)$ whenever M is an $AC_H(A)$-invariant subgroup of H.*

Proof. Assume false and choose $K_0 \in \mathrm{comp}_{\mathrm{sol}}(M)$ with $K_0 \neq K_0^t$. Set $K = \langle\, K_0^A \,\rangle \in \mathrm{comp}_{A,\mathrm{sol}}(M)$. Now $[K, t]$ is an A-invariant nonsolvable normal subgroup of K so $K = [K, t] \leq [H, t]$. Since $[H, t] \trianglelefteq H$ we have $\mathrm{comp}_{\mathrm{sol}}([H, t]) \subseteq \mathrm{comp}_{\mathrm{sol}}(H)$, hence we may assume that $H = [H, t]$. Passing to the quotient $H/\mathrm{sol}(H)$ we may also assume that $\mathrm{sol}(H) = 1$. Then $\mathrm{comp}_{\mathrm{sol}}(H) = \mathrm{comp}(H)$ and $C_H(E(H)) = 1$.

Since $H = [H, t]$ and t acts trivially on $\mathrm{comp}(H)$ it follows that every component of H is normal in H. As $C_H(E(H)) = 1$, the Schreier Property implies that $H/E(H)$ is solvable. Now K is perfect so $K \leq E(H)$ and then Lemma 7.6 implies there exists K^* with $K \leq K^* \in \mathrm{comp}_A(H)$. Hence we may assume that $K^* = H$, so that H is A-simple.

Without loss, $C_A(H) = 1$. Set

$$A_\infty = \ker(A \longrightarrow \mathrm{Sym}(\mathrm{comp}(H))),$$

so that $t \in A_\infty$. Since M is $AC_H(A)$-invariant and nonsolvable, it follows from [1, Lemmas 6.6 and 6.7] that either $M = C_H(B)$ for some $B \leq A$ with $B \cap A_\infty = 1$ or $M \leq C_H(A_\infty)$. The second possibility does not hold since $t \in A_\infty$ and $K = [K, t] \leq M$. Thus the first possibility holds. [1, Lemma 6.5] implies that M is A-simple. Since $K \in \mathrm{comp}_A(M)$ we have $K = M$, so $K = C_H(B)$. Then the components of K correspond to the orbits of B on $\mathrm{comp}(H)$. Since t is trivial $\mathrm{comp}(H)$ it normalizes each orbit of B and hence each component of K. This contradiction completes the proof. □

Lemma 9.7. *Suppose that A acts coprimely on the group H. Let $t \in A$ and suppose that t acts trivially on $\mathrm{comp}_{\mathrm{sol}}(H)$. If S is a simple section of $C_{[H,t]}(t)$ then there exists $L \in \mathrm{comp}_{\mathrm{sol}}(H)$ with $|\, S \,| < |\, L/\mathrm{sol}(L) \,|$.*

Proof. Coprime Action implies that $[H, t, t] = [H, t]$ and as $[H, t] \trianglelefteq H$ we have $\mathrm{comp}_{\mathrm{sol}}([H, t]) \subseteq \mathrm{comp}_{\mathrm{sol}}(H)$ so we may suppose that $H = [H, t]$. We may also pass to the quotient $H/\mathrm{sol}(H)$ to suppose that $\mathrm{sol}(H) = 1$.

Since t acts trivially on $\mathrm{comp}(H)$ and $H = [H, t]$ it follows that every component of H is normal in H. Let $L_1, \ldots, L_n$ be the components of H, so $E(H) = L_1 \times \cdots \times L_n$. As $\mathrm{sol}(H) = 1$ we have $C_H(E(H)) = 1$ and the Schreier Property implies that $H/E(H)$ is solvable. In particular, $C_H(t)/C_{E(H)}(t)$ is solvable so S is isomorphic to a simple section of $C_{E(H)}(t)$. Now $C_{E(H)}(t) = C_{L_1}(t) \times \cdots \times C_{L_n}(t)$. Thus S is isomorphic to a simple section of $C_{L_i}(t)$ for some i. Note that $C_{L_i}(t) \neq L_i$ since otherwise, as $L_i \trianglelefteq H\langle\, t \,\rangle$ and $H = [H, t]$, we would have $L_i \leq Z(H)$. Thus $|\, S \,| < |\, L_i \,|$ and the proof is complete. □

Proof of Theorem 9.2. Assume false and let θ be a minimal counterexample. By Lemma 9.6, the hypotheses of Lemma 9.5 are satisfied. Note that a group X is nonsolvable if and only if $\mathrm{comp}_{\mathrm{sol}}(X) \neq \emptyset$. By the Solvable Signalizer Functor Theorem, there exists a pair (b, K) with $b \in A^\#$ and $K \in \mathrm{comp}_{\mathrm{sol}}(\theta(b))$. Choose such a pair with $|\, K/\mathrm{sol}(K) \,|$ maximal. By Lemma 9.5 there exists $a, t \in A^\#$ such that $K/\mathrm{sol}(K)$ is isomorphic to a simple section of $C_{[\theta(a),t]}(t)$. Lemma 9.7 implies $|\, K/\mathrm{sol}(K) \,| < |\, L/\mathrm{sol}(L) \,|$ for some $L \in \mathrm{comp}_{\mathrm{sol}}(\theta(a))$. This contradicts the choice of (b, K) and completes the proof. □

References

1. P. Flavell, *Automorphisms of K-groups I,* Preprint: http://arxiv.org/abs/1609.01969
2. P. Flavell, *A new proof of the Solvable Signalizer Functor Theorem,* J. Algebra **398** (2014) 350-363
3. D. Gorenstein and R. Lyons, *Nonsolvable Signalizer Functors on Finite Groups,* Proc. London Math. Soc. **35** (3) (1977) 1-33
4. P.P. McBride, *Near solvable signalizer functors on finite groups,* J. Algebra **78**(1) (1982) 181-214
5. P.P. McBride, *Nonsolvable signalizer functors on finite groups,* J. Algebra **78**(1) (1982) 215-238

The School of Mathematics, University of Birmingham, Birmingham B15 2TT, Great Britain

E-mail address: P.J.Flavell@bham.ac.uk